

REMARKS

This Amendment supplements the amendments and remarks made in the October 21, 2003 Amendment. Claims 1 to 5, 9 to 11, 12, 23 to 31 are in the application, of which Claim 1 is the only independent claim. Claims 1, 2, 9, 10 and 11 are being amended, Claims 26 to 31 are being added, and Claim 14 is being cancelled, herein. Reconsideration and further examination are respectfully requested.

Applicants' undersigned attorney wishes to thank the Examiner for the January 14, 2004 interview. During the interview and in view of the request for a two-month suspension submitted with the Request For Continued Examination dated November 21, 2003, it was agreed that the Office Action mailed on December 23, 2003 would be withdrawn. In addition, the Examiner confirmed that he would not take any further action until after February 6, 2003, the date on which the two-month suspension is set to expire.

A request for entry of the Amendment dated October 21, 2003 was made in the November 21, 2003 Request For Continued Examination. This Amendment supplements the amendments and remarks made in the October 21, 2003 Amendment.

Amended Claim 1 provides for printout of an internet-based print job at a printer connected to an information processing device, a server connected to a plurality of information processing devices receives from an internet-based source a print job to be printed at a printer connected to an information processing device via a network, wherein the print job includes data associated with, and specific to, a user of the information processing device. The server obtains a print driver for the printer connected to the

information processing device, renders the print job using the print driver, and transfers the rendered print job over the network to the information processing device.

Among the many features, Claim 1 includes the features of receiving from an internet-based source a print job to be printed on a printer connected to an information processing device, the print job including data associated with and specific to a user of the information processing device, and transferring the print job including the user-specific data to the information processing device.

The applied art, namely Shafer and Bum, is not seen to disclose or to suggest the above-identified features.

Shafer is seen to describe a system in which video program content is broadcast to users' set-top boxes from a program control computer for display on each user's television. At certain times during a program, a user interface is displayed providing an option for a user to print preselected portions of the broadcast program. In a case that the user selects the option to print the preselected programming portion, image data corresponding to the selected portion of the program is retrieved from a image database, and downloaded to the user's printer. (See Shafer, col. 3, lines 10 to 26) Printing preselected still images of portions of programs broadcast over a cable network is not seen to be the same as transferring a print job including data associated with a user and specific to that user for printing on the user's printer.

} does not agree

In addition and as conceded in the July 23, 2003 Office Action, at page 4, Shafer fails to disclose receiving the print job from an internet-based source for printing on the user's printer. Thus, Shafer is not seen to in any way disclose receiving from an internet-based source a print job including print data associated with a user, and specific to

the user, and transferring the print job including the user-specific data to the information processing device.

Bum is not seen to remedy the deficiencies of Shafer. Bum is seen to describe a set top box configured to receive internet protocol packets from a personal computer connected to the set top box via ethernet and to forward a data packet via asynchronous transfer mode (ATM) to a cable head end having an internet gateway. Thus, Bum is merely seen to describe a configuration in which a user is able to send and receive IP packets via the set top box connected to the user's PC.

It is impliedly conceded in the July 23, 2003 Office Action that Bum fails to disclose transferring a print job via the configuration described in Bum. In fact, Bum is not seen to describe a print job received from an internet-based source. In addition, nothing in Bum is seen to disclose or even to suggest the features of: a server receiving a print job from an internet-based source; the print job to be printed on a printer connected to an information processing device, wherein the print job includes data associated with a user and specific to a user of the information processing device; and the server rendering the print job and then transferring the print job, including the user-specific data, to the information processing device.

Evans, IV is understood to be cited in the Office Action for the purpose of showing that a page description language can be printer-independent. However, the reasons given for citing Evans, IV are not seen to remedy the deficiencies noted above with respect to Shafer and Bum.

Accordingly and based on the amendments and remarks made herein and in the October 21, 2003 Amendment, Claim 1 is believed to be patentable over the applied

art. Therefore, for at least the foregoing reasons, Claim 1 is believed to be in condition for allowance.

Turning to dependent Claim 12, it has the further feature that the internet-based print job is a push-print print job originating from the internet-based source. At page 6 of the July 23, 2003 Office Action, it is stated that DeVries teaches, at col. 4, lines 12 to 19, the electronic distribution of magazines, which the Office Action further indicates is considered to be the same as an internet-based push-print print job. Applicant respectfully submits that DeVries is seen to describe "distribution" of published articles such that a user pulls the data from a publisher's site for viewing on the user's computer. Pulling of the data to a computer by the computer user is not seen to be the same as a push-print print job originating from an internet-based source.

More particularly, DeVries is seen to describe a system in which a user, as a subscriber, pulls article data from a publisher's site for viewing on the user's computer. (See DeVries, Abstract) In order to view an article, the user activates an article box of a user interface displayed in a screen of the user's computer. As a result of the user's activation of the article box, the user's computer retrieves the article from the publisher. The requested article is then formatted for viewing on a monitor or printed on a printer. (See DeVries, col. 6, lines 5 to 14) Thus, DeVries is seen to describe a user pulling the article data from the publisher's site by activating the article box displayed on the user's computer. This is not seen to be the same as a push-print print job which is originated by other than the user, and in particular is not seen to be the same as a push-print print job which originates from an internet-based source.

Accordingly, Applicants submit that dependent Claim 12 is patentable over the applied art, namely Shafer, Bum and DeVries.

New Claim 30 includes the added feature that the data, some portion of which is associated with, and specific to, a user of the information processing device, is generated based on a request from the user.

New Claim 31 includes the added feature of determining, by the server, whether to accept a push-print job received from the internet-based source, and to perform the steps of obtain, rendering and transferring based on the outcome of the determination.

The applied art is not seen to disclose or to suggest the above-identified features. Accordingly, Claims 30 and 31 are believed to be patentable over the applied art.

The remaining claims are each dependent from the independent claims discussed above and are therefore believed patentable for the same reasons. Because each dependent claim is also deemed to define an additional aspect of the invention, however, the individual consideration of each on its own merits is respectfully requested.

In view of the amendments and remarks presented herein, together with the amendments and remarks presented in the October 21, 2003, the entire application is believed to be in condition for allowance, and such action is respectfully requested at the Examiner's earliest convenience.

Applicants' undersigned attorney may be reached in our Costa Mesa,
California office at (714) 540-8700. All correspondence should continue to be directed to
our below-listed address.

Respectfully submitted,



Attorney for Applicants

Registration No. 39,000

FITZPATRICK, CELLA, HARPER & SCINTO
30 Rockefeller Plaza
New York, New York 10112-2200
Facsimile: (212) 218-2200

CA_MAIN 76352 v 1